

Commonwealth and PREPA as well as a psychological study of the adverse effect that these actions have caused on the general elderly population of the areas impacted by the Via Verde project.

Understanding that these actions and policies are an open violation of the Older American Act and the federal statutes and regulations of which you are particularly in charge of administering, we request a formal filing of this complaint before the Corps.

If you have any doubts or questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office at (787) 721-6121.

Cordially,

ROSSANA LÓPEZ LEÓN, MSG,
Ombudsman for the Elderly.

ABORTION DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Abortion is one of the most divisive issues in America. One side sees the child in the womb as nothing but tissue, like a skin mole, and no one should tell a woman when and if she can have an unnecessary and inconvenient tissue removed from her body. The other side looks at that "tissue" in the womb and sees it sucking its thumb, reacting to her mother singing, and possessing unique DNA, and asks the question: How can that not be a child?

The debate about life will not be resolved today, though for the sake of millions of children who will die in the womb in abortion clinics, I wish it could have been resolved yesterday. H.R. 3, which we will be discussing all day today asks the question: Should the Federal Government ever use taxpayer dollars to pay for or supplement abortions?

When the Nation is so divided over this issue, isn't it common sense not to force a person who is passionately opposed to the death of the unborn to assist in paying for the procedure?

H.R. 3 also protects the conscience of health care providers to not be forced to perform a procedure that they believe violates their most basic oath: Do no harm.

Each year, this Congress votes to prohibit abortion funding through our appropriations process. It's time that we settled this issue permanently and clearly. No taxpayer funding, support, or tax incentives of abortion in any way for this year, in any future year.

In a day of skyrocketing debt, how can we justify supplementing abortion and saying that it's a necessary and essential element of government? I think we cannot.

This is time to resolve this issue. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 3 today in that vote.

OUR DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the great debate over oil and gas prices, there are actually many things we can all agree on. We agree our dependence on foreign oil endangers our environment, hurts our economy, and weakens our national security. Our disagreement lies in potential solutions.

I believe that in order to lower gas prices, we can and must crack down on oil speculators, end Big Oil handouts, invest in public transit and electric vehicles, and increase corporate average fuel economy standards. The other side of the argument would have you believe that all we need to do is increase our domestic oil resources and remove regulations—regulations that purportedly forced us to look outside our Nation's borders for oil.

Our answers do not lie in more oil. Our answers lie in conservation and smart investments.

Talk about smart investment—every increase of 1 mile per gallon in auto fuel efficiency yields more oil than can be found in two Arctic National Wildlife Refuges. An improvement right now of 2.7 miles per gallon would eliminate our need for all Persian Gulf oil.

But it's not a question of simple domestic supply and demand either, another argument the other side of this issue will use. Oil prices are set on a global oil market. Historically, such small increases in U.S. production have had little or no impact on world oil prices.

The U.S. Energy Information Administration, or EIA, states in a 2008 report that Arctic Refuge oil production "is not expected to have a large impact on world oil prices," noting that OPEC "could neutralize any potential price impact of ANWR coastal plain production by reducing its exports by an equal amount."

Again, our answer does not lie in increased domestic oil production. Our answer lies in conservation and in a solid commitment to investment in renewable energy resources.

Recent increases in conservation and use of alternative technologies has cut our Nation's projected need for imported oil between now and 2050 by more than 100 billion barrels. That's 10 times more benefit that we might be able to get during the same period from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, without sacrificing one of our Nation's most valued wilderness ecosystems.

In the past few years, we've taken small steps to focus on conservation rather than production. In late 2007, corporate average fuel standards, commonly known as CAFE standards, received their first overhaul in more than 30 years. This was a huge step in the right direction, but there remains much work to do.

The bills we will consider in the coming week will endanger our environment, hurt our economy, and weaken our national security. It seems to me these are the very same concerns we have with an overarching reliance and addiction to foreign oil.

H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1230 supplant our national environmental policies, tell residents along our coasts we don't care how they feel about drilling in their waters, damage the ecosystems the industries along our coasts rely on, and go against what military experts have been saying about drilling.

Just weeks ago, several former military officers shared their thoughts and concern. "America's dependence on oil constitutes a clear and present danger to the security and welfare of the United States." And they continue to say they are concerned with congressional efforts to undermine the agencies charged with overseeing extraction. What they are saying is it's important to reduce our dependence on foreign oil for our national security's sake, and it's important to retain regulatory authority to oversee drilling and extraction of oil and gas. Then, you follow that it's important to regulate our extraction in order to protect our Nation.

These bills do not offer solutions. And what is worse, a full year following the disaster of the Macondo/Deepwater well, we have yet to reform our Outer Continental Shelf policy. But, again, you don't need to take my word for it.

The U.S. Energy Information Administration put out a 2009 report comparing the difference between full, unrestricted offshore drilling and restricted offshore drilling. EIA found that in 2020, restrictions on drilling versus unrestricted access had no impact on cost. The cost per barrel was identical. In 2030, indiscriminate drilling would lower our gas prices by just 3 cents.

Take the calls for drilling in the Arctic Refuge as another example. Even at peak production in 2030, Arctic Refuge oil would account for six-tenths of 1 percent of world oil production and only 2.4 percent of U.S. oil consumption.

We can proactively move our Nation toward reducing our dependence on foreign oil so that we can take control of our energy future, protect our Nation, our economy, and our environment. And we must.

SPENDING-DRIVEN DEBT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. If your car is speeding into a ditch, the only thing to do to survive is to slam the brakes as fast and hard as you can. Anything else only stalls the disaster to come.

At this moment, America is speeding into bankruptcy, and the only way to stop the descent and save our country is to slam the brakes on government spending and set our Nation on a brand new fiscal trajectory.

Critical times call for critical measures. The American people deserve honest and courageous leadership from